



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Reuchlin, and a multitude of others who never became Protestants, contributed scarcely less to its success than those who were exclusively theologians. The reformers, both in England and abroad, were as learned persons as that age, or any other age, produced; men who fathomed the deepest ecclesiastical studies of their time. In the next century, Jeremy Taylor and Ussher, and after them Stillingfleet and Barrow, followed the same method with equal success, and were inferior to none in learning, ancient or modern; and we venture to foretell, that if England shall ever lapse again into a taste for medieval practices and opinions, it will not be because mankind have become more learned or more humble, but because they have become too indolent and impatient to tread the laborious paths of sound learning and independent thought, and prefer blindly handing over their minds and consciences to the keeping and guidance of others more bold, and perhaps less scrupulous, than themselves, to the more troublesome and anxious task of exercising spiritual freedom and moral self-government.

DR. CULLEN'S PASTORAL ON THE FESTIVAL OF ST. PATRICK.

We think it a favourable sign of the times when Roman Catholic prelates think it necessary to reason with their flocks, and inculcate kindly feelings towards those who differ with them in matters of religion.

We rejoice to see some symptoms of this better state of things in the Most Reverend Dr. Cullen's last Pastoral, which was ordered to be read in each chapel or church of the diocese of Dublin on Passion Sunday in March last; and though we think there are various passages which savour rather too much of that bitterness of ancient rancour against their Protestant fellow-countrymen which it has so long been the aim of the Roman Catholic priesthood to perpetuate in Ireland, yet on the whole we are glad to recognize passages of which we can cordially approve, and sentiments which we hope henceforth to see oftener.

Dr. Cullen, acknowledging that "times of party persecution have ceased" (p. 26) against his party in Ireland, and animadverting very justly on the harsh manner in which some ministers of Protestantism inveigh against the (R.) Catholic religion, but which he admits that a large number of "enlightened, liberal-minded Protestants highly condemn," thus proceeds, p. 27:—

"Jesus Christ has told us, that charity is to be in every age the characteristic mark of His disciples. Is there any trace of this holy virtue in the conduct of those preachers, whose only study it is to excite feelings of rancour and hatred in the bosoms of their hearers? Would it not appear that they are intent on banishing charity from the world? Do they thus show that they are not the disciples of our meek and charitable Saviour, Jesus Christ? How are we, dearly beloved, to meet this conduct? By praying most fervently for the conversion of the misguided men who are leading others astray, by returning good for evil, and by a continual practice of charity. We have religious doctrines of our own to teach or to learn; we have duties to perform; we have our own defects to correct. Let us leave those who, forgetting themselves, only think of us, to the judgment and the mercy of God."

We heartily wish that these excellent admonitions were echoed by every pulpit and repeated in every publication throughout the length and breadth of our distracted country. If such truly Christian advice was practically followed, and honestly carried out, how soon would the whole aspect of society be remodelled, and the national character redeemed and elevated. Fellow-countrymen might still differ in matters of opinion, or as to religious ceremonies and observances; but it would not longer be possible for fellow-countrymen worshipping the same benevolent Deity, breathing the same atmosphere, and protected by the same laws, to hate or to vilify, to persecute or do injury one to the other. We respond most warmly to Dr. Cullen's exhortation "to pray most fervently for the conversion of those who are leading men astray, to return good for evil, and for a continual practice of charity."

We think, however, that Dr. Cullen scarcely practises the charity he so touchingly preaches, when, in the very next page, 28, he denounces the mass of scripture readers and other spiritual agents at present at work in Ireland, under the guidance of earnest individuals and various religious societies, as "ignorant" and "degraded" characters, who "talk of the Bible, but do not read it or understand it, and who in quoting a few distorted texts against our doctrines, are only blaspheming what they do not know: men who, in the hour of distress, renounced their religion, or were driven into apostacy by intemperance, immorality, and degrading vices, and, like the fallen angels, seek to have companions of their disgrace." "To reason with such agents would be useless. They are to be avoided, as if infected with the plague." "There are now in this country thousands of hired agents of proselytism, who make it their occupation to lay in wait for the poor, invade their houses, and try to sap the foundations of their faith."

Now, it may be true, for all we know to the contrary, that some few unworthy men, actuated by unholy motives and whose moral characters or religious acquirements render them unfit for the duties they have undertaken, may have from time to time intruded themselves into the office of scriptural teachers or readers, by, for a

time, deceiving and imposing on the well meaning and excellent men who, we earnestly believe, are using the best agency within their power or procuring for the spread of gospel truths and religious education through the country; but we solemnly protest against the uncharitable assertion, that any considerable number of the thousand agents of proselytism (as Dr. Cullen calls them) now in Ireland can fairly be characterized in the colours in which he has painted them. We believe that a vast majority of the spiritual agents employed by Protestants of any sect throughout this country are men of temperate and moral habits, who both understand the Bible, and are zealously anxious to propagate what they and their employers believe to be the true religion which the Lord Jesus died on the cross to establish; and sure we are that not a single agent has ever been continued or is at present employed in such a work whose character is known by those who employ him to be tainted with any of the disgraceful vices which Dr. Cullen has endeavoured to imprint upon the whole body of Protestant missionary agents in Ireland. It is, however, very difficult for men of Dr. Cullen's habits of thought and action to avoid the temptation of trying to confound all his opponents in one indiscriminate censure, and to excite the passions and prejudices of his followers, even when preaching the holiest precepts of that religious charity which he admits that "Jesus Christ has taught us is in every age to be the characteristic mark of his disciples."

We must now proceed to notice the argumentative parts of Dr. Cullen's Pastoral. Before doing so, however, we would venture to suggest a word of caution to those respected dignitaries, clergymen, and lay members of the Protestant establishment under whose sanction missionary agents are at present in operation in this country; and we do so the more freely, because, while humbly and earnestly labouring in the same cause of propagating what we earnestly believe to be religious truth, we are ourselves wholly unconnected with any of the societies who have the selection, employment, or superintendence of such agents in any part of Ireland.

gather, the sending additional spiritual agency to any locality, however urgently it may appear to them or others to be in need of it, than to send forth men in whose characters and intelligence they cannot feel well-founded confidence. We feel sure that more harm than good has sometimes been done by the employment of those whose spiritual character and acquirements are not suited to the task (at all times a delicate and difficult one) of attempting to alter or improve the modes of thought and habits of conduct of their fellow-countrymen. However inadequate to the exigencies of the case a small number of tried and unexceptionable men may be, we earnestly believe that a handful of such in each county would do more real and permanent good than a similar number of half-qualified agents in every parish. The persons to be influenced in Ireland are sharp-witted, and quick at detecting defects, which others are not slow at publishing and exaggerating; and thus the influence of the best may be marred, if not neutralized, by the indiscretion and intemperance, or the sloth and unspiritual tone of others, with whom they are associated in name, though, perhaps, wholly unconnected in any other way. We speak not, of course, of such degraded characters as Dr. Cullen describes; but we think that men may be wholly untainted by the grosser vices of intemperance or immorality, and yet be far from duly qualified to perform the solemn functions of controversial teachers or spiritual agents, and be wholly unfit safely to be held out to the world as the acknowledged representatives of Protestantism in places where the majority of the people are professedly Roman Catholics. We now come to consider the assertions and arguments of Dr. Cullen.

Availing himself of the topics connected with the Apostle of Ireland, whose memory every Irishman acquainted with his history cannot fail to respect, Dr. Cullen endeavours to appropriate all the glory of St. Patrick to the Church of Rome, by making a number of assertions, each of which requires historical proof. Whether he has proved any of them we shall venture to consider presently.

1st, He says, that "all antiquity attests that St. Patrick proceeded to Rome to obtain jurisdiction from the Holy See before he entered on his mission, being persuaded that his labours would be cursed with sterility if they were not undertaken with the blessing of Christ's Vicar on earth, and that he would enjoy no spiritual authority unless he derived it from the Centre of Unity" (p. 19). "As the Apostle of the Gentiles went to Jerusalem to confer with St. Peter, lest he should run in vain, so did St. Patrick hasten to Rome to venerate the successor of the Fisherman, and to receive his commission from him" (p. 20). So our forefathers, having received the faith through St. Patrick from the Apostolic source, they were always distinguished by an undying attachment and devotion to the centre of unity, the chair of St. Peter" (p. 22).

2ndly, He asserts that the faith planted here by St. Patrick was identically the same as that now professed at the present day, after fourteen centuries, by the (Roman) Catholic Church in Ireland (p. 9), more especially as regards the cardinal point of belief in the supremacy of the Holy See (p. 19).

These two propositions (with a third, which Dr. Cullen implies rather than asserts—viz., that the doctrines of the Church of Rome in the fifth century were identical with those of the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century) form the basis of his argument in his present Pastoral, and we shall proceed to consider how far the proofs he has adduced in support of them establish their truth. Upon the historical truth or falsehood of these propositions the whole weight of Dr. Cullen's argument must depend. And surely these are points about which men ought to be able to speak and write calmly, and examine fairly, nay, even to differ widely, without any bitterness or breach of charity. At any rate, the only way of arriving at the truth is by calm and honest inquiry, and listening impartially to the reasons and evidence brought forward on both sides, by any one who can reasonably be supposed to understand the subject in question. We shall seriously endeavour not to break the rules of candour and Christian charity in anything we are about to write, and we trust that any who may be induced to follow us or Dr. Cullen in the discussion, whether orally or in writing, will take care to do so in the same spirit.

The first point we shall discuss is the question whether St. Patrick was sent to Ireland by, or had a commission from, Rome to preach the Gospel in Ireland. This is a simple matter of fact to be decided by historical evidence, if it exists, and if not, by inferences to be reasonably deduced from any authentic documents which do exist. It is not with us, indeed, a matter of any material importance, unless it be taken for granted that the doctrines held at Rome in the year 432 contained, in addition to those of the ancient creeds, the twelve additional articles of faith promulgated in the year 1564, in the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; which we are convinced, and think we are able to prove, they did not. Did the Roman Catholic Church now hold only the articles of faith which they can prove to have been universally held in the Church in the year 432, we should have no great disposition to debate the question whether St. Patrick was sent to Ireland by Pope Celestine, or whether he undertook the mission independently of the authority of Rome, as we sincerely believe to have been the case.

Suppose, however, that St. Patrick was sent by Rome, it would not follow that those he baptized were subject to the Church which sent him; for, if such an argument were of any weight, then all Churches, and Rome among them, would be subject to the Church of Jerusalem, for all the Apostles came forth from her. She was the mother Church of all Christendom. Therefore, even if the inhabitants of Ireland were baptized by a Roman missionary, it does not follow that they thereby became subject to Rome, but only to Christ.

What, however, is the evidence that St. Patrick was sent from Rome?

We should, of course, naturally look for it either in the works of St. Patrick himself, or in those of the historians of the Church in his time.

Now, in the first place, it is remarkable that his supposed connection with Rome is never alluded to, directly or indirectly, in St. Patrick's own works. We have those works, in the original Latin, "now before us, and in none of them is there any allusion to his supposed mission, except in one of acknowledged spuriousness, called "Charta de Antiquitate Averlonica," which the learned editor, J. L. Villaneua (himself a Roman Catholic priest), proves in his appendix, p. 294, to be "inaniter S. Patricio adscipta;" while in his preface, p. xxiii., he says of it, "Quæ suspectæ fidei est, et recentiorem statem redolent."

This is the more remarkable, because, both in his celebrated "Confession," and in his "Epistle to Coroticus," both of which are indisputably genuine, St. Patrick ascribes his mission exclusively to a heavenly call, without making any mention of either Rome or the Bishop. Is it possible to believe that, if it had been true that St. Patrick (as Dr. Cullen asserts, p. 19) "proceeded to Rome to obtain jurisdiction from the Holy See before he entered on his mission, being persuaded that his labours would be cursed with sterility if they were not undertaken with the blessing of Christ's Vicar on Earth, and that he would enjoy no spiritual authority unless he derived it from the centre of unity," yet that St. Patrick should never have said one word about such an important matter, as he must have considered it, according to Dr. Cullen's hypothesis (to say nothing of such a journey, which was in itself no light matter in the year 432), when recording his history and sentiments for the use of posterity?

Next in point of antiquity is, perhaps, the hymn of St. Sechnall (Secundinus), composed in praise of the great Apostle of Ireland, St. Patrick, and which our readers will find at length in our 2nd vol., p. 134. Secundinus died somewhere about A.D. 447.

It is almost equally remarkable that no mention is made in this ancient hymn of St. Patrick having been sent by Pope Celestine, though there are so many places in it where such a mention would have been most appropriate and instructive. He is said to have "received his apostleship from God, even as St. Paul was sent by God

to the Gentiles." "The Saviour advanced him to be a bishop." "Christ chose him to be his *vicar* on the earth." And yet not one word to suggest that the Pope was such "vicar," or had anything to do with the apostleship of St. Patrick, the hero of the eulogy.

Let us proceed now to the ecclesiastical historians. *Prosper Aquitanus* lived at that time. He composed "Annals of the Church," and was a friend of Pope Celestine and a notary of the Roman See. Palladius was sent to Ireland by Pope Celestine the very year before St. Patrick's arrival, A.D. 431, and his mission was utterly sterile, a complete and acknowledged failure, though coming with the Pope's blessing and authority. Prosper does not omit to record that Palladius was sent by Pope Celestine, though his mission lasted but a few months, and was, as we have said, so wholly abortive; but *Prosper makes no mention whatever of St. Patrick*, who came to Ireland in the very next year, and preached the gospel here with the most astonishing success for half a century. If St. Patrick had been sent from Rome, surely Prosper must have known the fact, and knowing it, could not have failed to record it!

Neither does it appear to have been known to the Irish writer, *Muirchin Macchu Machteri* (*Maccuthenius*), who wrote the life of St. Patrick in the seventh century. We gave the headings of the chapters relating to this part of St. Patrick's history, which prove this plainly, in our 2nd vol., p. 34, note.

We next naturally turn to the most ancient of our English church historians, the Venerable Bede, who was born A.D. 672, less than 200 years after St. Patrick's death. He completed his "Ecclesiastical History" A.D. 731, and was, as he himself tells us, supplied with materials for it from the archives of Rome. Bede, too, having been reared in the Anglo-Saxon Church, in which Rome then exercised much influence, omitted no opportunity of advancing her credit, sometimes even to the disparagement of the ancient British and Irish Churches. Now, what do we find in Bede? Of course, our readers will suppose that he is eloquent and diffuse touching St. Patrick's mission, and attributes it to the blessing and authority of the Centre of Unity, Christ's Vicar on Earth. But the fact is, and there are few more striking in church history, that the Venerable Bede records the mission of Palladius to Ireland, and often refers to the affairs of the Irish Church, but *never once mentions* in it even the name of *St. Patrick*!

We might add to this many more arguments to prove that it is almost certain that St. Patrick was not sent by Rome, was not dependent on Rome; but we think we have said enough, for the present at least, to show that it will require something stronger and more satisfactory than Dr. Cullen's bare assertion that "*all antiquity* attests that St. Patrick hastened to Rome to venerate the successor of the Fisherman, and to receive his commission from him," to prove that Ireland owes its conversion to Rome, or that the Apostle derived his authority to preach from the same source.

"All antiquity," at least, it is plain, does not include the earliest ecclesiastical historians of Rome, England, and Ireland, nor the works of St. Patrick, or of his contemporary, St. Sechnall. Dr. Cullen gives us no clue where antiquity attests, what we have proved is not attested by those who ought to have known it best, and were the most likely to record such a fact, if they had known it."

We must reserve the consideration of Dr. Cullen's second position till our next number.

MANUAL OF LA SALETTE.

We have now before us a gaily bound little volume ushered into the world with all the modern attractions of blue and gold, entitled a "Manual of the Confraternity of *La Salette*, comprising every information concerning *La Salette*, with devotions for the confraternities established in England,—by the Rev. John Wyse, Catholic priest," and with the approbation prefixed to it of Dr. Ullathorne, calling himself the Bishop of Birmingham, whose name has already more than once appeared in our pages in connection with this subject.

This approbation bears date June 9, 1855, and is as follows:—

"*Approbation of his lordship the Bishop of Birmingham:*
"I have read the book entitled 'The Manual of the Confraternity of *La Salette*,' and find nothing in it contrary to faith and good morals: on the contrary, I consider it is calculated to promote piety and devotion, especially to the Mother of God."

✠ W. B. ULLATHORNE."

We collect from it that this new devotion (as it is called) was "introduced by Mr. Dayman, priest at Stratford-on-Avon, who was the first to erect a confraternity of *La Salette* in England, and that his example has since been followed by several other priests, who have petitioned their bishops for leave to establish the confraternity in their churches" (p. 44).

It is stated also in the same work (p. 46) that "it is no uncommon thing in France and Germany, as the warm days set in, to see gentlemen of noble race, with their

families, prepare for a pious journey to *La Salette*, and perform it, too, with devotion, at no little expense. Barristers, physicians, military men, merchants, and members of all professions in life follow the same course, and seem to vie with one another in aiming at as high a tone of religious feeling as this age will bear."

If these statements be not exaggerated, we confess we think them not a little humiliating, as a proof of the gullibility and credulity of the age in which we live.

We had hoped that the detailed *exposé* by the Abbé Deleon of the whole imposture, which he proved conclusively in his elaborate work published at Grenoble, in the immediate vicinity of the alleged event, to have been a deception practised by a half-crazed enthusiast, *Mademoiselle Constance Lameriere* (confirmed as it has been by the decision of the courts of justice at Grenoble, which dismissed, with costs, the action which the said *Mademoiselle Lameriere* brought against the author for defamation of character), would have opened the eyes of the most blind upon the subject, exploded the whole illusion,

"*And, like the baseless fabric of a vision,
Left not a wreath behind.*"

But we fear there are too many persons interested in propagating such tales lightly to give them up; and it would appear from this "Manual," that even in England there must be some people (we hope but few in number) who are able to close their eyes to any amount of light which comes to them from a quarter which they are determined not to be enlightened by, and are resolved, not only to uphold the story at what cost soever, but if they can, to exalt it into the foundation of a new order of religion.

The masterly work of the Abbé Deleon, to which we have above alluded, is a large octavo of 370 pages; and though we specially called the attention of our readers to it, in Nos. 42 and 43 of our periodical, it has not, as far as we can learn, ever yet been noticed by Dr. Ullathorne, though we did not fail to *call his attention* to it by forwarding to him the numbers of the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, in which we gave extracts from it, as soon as published. We do not wonder that Dr. Ullathorne has not answered it, for we believe it would have been utterly impossible; but we do wonder that he is not ashamed, before he has attempted such a reply, to approve of a manual which endeavours to make a *disputed and disproved fact* the basis of an attempt to *promote piety* in England!

We have so often observed the artful and insinuating tone of recent Roman Catholic works in England, written, no doubt, in the fond, but futile, hope that the Protestants of that country were ready, and even anxious, to become Romanists in large numbers, that we think it a remarkable indication that such an expectation has been at last abandoned as a hopeless one, to see Dr. Ullathorne affixing his *imprimatur* and *cordial approbation* to a work such as that now before us.

The tone is still more striking than the matter; but both are instructive, and illustrative of the small amount of Christian *charity* which may sometimes consort with that kind of *transcendental piety* which is ready to swallow anything, however incredible, if it only favours particular views in the matter of religion.

The writer is of opinion, evidently, that it is no longer of any use to attempt to win over Protestants, and very wisely, perhaps, gives them up in despair. "This manual," says the writer, "may be ill calculated to win heretics to the faith;" but "pandering to Protestant prejudice and ignorance has proved to be a mere chimera: we gain nothing by it for ourselves, and lose a great deal, whilst not one soul the more is drawn to the Church." "England is an unchristian country, and to attempt to *fraternize* with half-infidels (or, as he expresses it in page 44, 'the paganism around'), by paring away from our faith whatever we consistently can, is not the way to remain Catholics ourselves" (page 31).

The picture drawn of Protestant England is strikingly uncandid, and about as classical in style as it is charitable in spirit.

"Sunday is not observed in England; at least, it is observed here *less than anywhere else!*" (page 14). "The distinction made of English Protestants on the Continent is the habit of cursing and swearing. The French have nicknamed English travellers abroad 'Messieurs les God-dams'" (page 17). "Men seem, indeed, to have preserved the idea of God in their minds only to swear and blaspheme by His name" (page 16). "Can it be imagined that the wrath of God is not ever enkindled, as, looking down from his heavenly throne, he sees His altars still overthrown, and His sanctuaries yet ever *polluted* by the rites of a *degraded sect*?" Add to this the great number of evil associations, disunited amongst themselves, yet brought together by the one *devilish* object common to all, of disseminating blasphemies against Christ's holy religion with an energy so atrocious that the very *fiends in hell* could hardly match it. See how this crime of blasphemy has crept into the scientific literature of the age—with what Satanic craft and consummate ability the dark work is carried on in our leading books and journals. In other countries men blaspheme God, it is true; but then, at least, it is done openly and without hypocrisy. In England only could men be found to set up 'chairs of pestilence,' as the Scripture calls them, when in the very act,

perhaps, of invoking God's vengeance, by flinging away, with contempt, every doctrine *He preached*, and every truth *He revealed*. It is said, in reply, that all this is often done in ignorance. No doubt it is; but what blind and awful ignorance! With a saving clause for persons to react the dreadful spectacle of the Jews before our Lord would scarcely be more terrible. The Jews were ignorant: who, unless blasphemers in the nineteenth century, will say they were not guilty? Surely, then, it is an awful sight before the eternal throne of God, to behold a vast multitude, however ignorant, led on by the devil, and joining in a blind and passionate onslaught on the holiest of institutions and the sublimest mysteries of Heaven. Can it be possible that Almighty God has looked on unmoved, and that, consequently, the reproaches of *La Salette* are not for us? The question has but one answer in the *heart of a Christian*" (page 17-18).

What may be the Rev. John Wyse's idea of what the *heart of a Christian* ought to be we can scarcely, perhaps, gather very satisfactorily from this piece of unmeasured and bitter vituperation; but we may safely say, that he who uses, and Dr. Ullathorne who *approves*, of such language and deems it "calculated to promote piety and devotion," must have a peculiar view of Christian feeling, and an equally strange idea of the proper manner of persuading the human mind, if they think heretic Englishmen will be led to "devotion towards the Mother of God" by such coarse and extravagant tirades and philippics, equally devoid of truth, moderation, or Christian charity. For what class of readers such a work was designed by its author we are, of course, ignorant, save so far as he himself divulges it, when he says, in p. 31, that he "hopes these remarks may serve not *unfavourably* to introduce *La Salette* to some readers hitherto inclined to scepticism." Were we to form our own judgment upon the *point*, Mr. Wyse's object *must have been* to terrify *rational* Roman Catholics into swallowing wholesale whatever miraculous stories their ecclesiastical superiors think fit to propose to them, without venturing either to inquire into or investigate the evidence for or against their truth; while he, at the same time, is obliged to admit that the matter in question is not *de fide*, or one which it is *necessary* that a good Catholic should believe, unless he happened himself to be satisfied of its truth.

At any rate, the views of the writer as to faith scarcely appear to us to be calculated to incline the "sceptical" to adopt them. One would suppose that *faith* was a mere act of the *will*, with which the *understanding* had nothing to do; that it could be *given* like money at the pleasure of the donor; and that any inquiry into the truth or falsehood of such matters was a mere vicious gratification of human pride and presumptuous private judgment, only practised in Protestant England, and by persons tainted with what Mr. Wyse calls "the pestiferous principles of the age." We shall here, however, let the devoted teacher of the confraternity speak for himself. After citing some arguments in favour of the truth of the story, taken from a letter published, we believe, in *L'Ami de la Religion* in 1848 by a M. Dupauloup (who afterwards became Bishop of Orleans, and seems, as we are informed in the Abbé Deleon's book, p. 151, in 1851, after seeing more of the matter, to have materially changed his ideas upon the subject), the Rev. Mr. Wyse proceeds thus, p. 27:—

"The truth of the Apparition of *La Salette* is incontestable. Those who have eyes to see and ears to hear believe it to be certain; and, prejudice aside, if ever circumstantial evidence is a *proof* (and English lawyers say it is the strongest), where could a better chain of proof be found? It is, therefore, worthy of the fullest belief. And yet, it is *not of Faith*. We are not so forced to believe it, that, if we do not, we shall be damned for our unbelief. Only may it be said, that any one would prove himself exceedingly rash and devoid of Catholic instincts who would start with a conviction that it was manifestly false, because without the range of natural events. Almighty God is as equally master of the supernatural as of the natural, and if, after the plainest testimony, it seems clear that He *has* judged supernatural revelation beneficial to His Church in these times, why act like Thomas and withhold credence? 'Blessed are those who have not seen, and yet have believed.' Now, practically speaking, in England there is a great want of this sort of willing faith. Of course, it is not meant to speak here of Protestants; faith with them is out of the question. They do not believe in the *essential* truths of salvation, much less, therefore, in that which is not of necessity. But, unfortunately, by contact with Protestants, and by constantly breathing an atmosphere of rationalism, the faith of many Catholics, firm enough in its way, has become, if we may be allowed to use the expression, ungenerous and stingy. Pushed and goaded on every side, and at last almost persuaded that the wonderful doctrines of the Catholic Church are quite hard task enough on their belief, they contract their faith into as small a space as possible. They take in what they are obliged, and nothing more. These good persons are Catholics, it is true; but they are not Catholic-minded. 'Tell me,' says a great writer, 'what they believe beyond the essential truths of the Church, and I will tell you the measure of their faith, or words to that effect. They believe, for instance, in the possibility of miracles, but feel somehow quite uncomfortable when a miracle occurs, the truth of which they cannot contest. What miserable sort of work is this? If we are to be Catholics, why not be so to the full at once? We shall get nothing in the world by the contrary. The infidels and blasphemers will only laugh in their sleeve at us. We shall be insulted and persecuted just the same; but shall we be dearer to God for our thirstiness in matter of faith? Far from it. God loves the cheerful giver. All this comes

⁴ Those who would see this subject followed out further in a very masterly manner would do well to consult Canon Wordsworth's fourth series of Occasional Sermons, preached in Westminster Abbey, on the Church History of Ireland, Sermon xxvi, *The Age of St. Patrick*, Rivington, London, 1862.